Tll

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/620,581 | 07/15/2003 | Ekambaram Balaji | 030773/2868P | 8889 |

| 7590 04/18/2007 | EXAMINER |
|---|---|
| Sandeep Jaggi | PRICE, NATHAN E |

Sandeep Jaggi
LSI Logic Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
1551 McCarthy Blvd., M/S D-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

| | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|---|
| | 2194 | |

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|---|
| 3 MONTHS | 04/18/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/620,581 | BALAJI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Nathan Price | 2194 |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 January 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,7,9,11-15,18,19,21 and 23-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,7,9,11-15,18,19,21 and 23-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*WILLIAM THOMSON*
*SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER*

**Attachment(s)**

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communications received 22 January 2007.
Claims 1-3,6,7,9,11-15,18,19,21 and 23-30 are pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed 22 January 2007 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues Sharma fails to teach providing an adapter API native to the
client applications and that the claims recite a language independent adapter API.
Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the disclosure focuses on Java, Sharma
teaches a native adapter API that can function with different types of systems [¶ 37].
One reason for using XML is to provide compatibility between different systems [¶ 8 –
9]. Regarding exporting data, Sharma teaches methods export and process data using
web services as claimed [¶ 5, 115, 127]. It is not clear why Applicant disagrees (see
page 10 ¶ 3 of Applicant's arguments filed 22 January 2007).

### *Claim Objections*

4. Claims 27 – 30 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 27 states "the first and second methods." It is believed Applicant intended
to state "the first and second sets of methods."

Appropriate correction is required.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.      Claims 1 - 3, 6, 10, 13 - 15, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645 A1; hereinafter Sharma).

As to claims 1 - 3, 6 and 10 Sharma teaches:

[Claim 1] a method for providing data integration and exchange between a

plurality of client applications over a network, wherein each of the client applications

access a respective data source, and wherein the data sources of each of the client

applications may be stored in different formats and not directly accessible by the other

client applications [¶ 5, 8, 10, 37], the method comprising:

(a) providing an adapter API native to the client applications that provides a first

set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data

sources into XML format [Fig. 5; ¶ 127]; and

(b) modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data into the respective data sources into XML format and to have the XML formatted data imported into a database on a server, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources [¶ 115, 127];

[Claim 2] (c) including a second set of methods in the adapter API for the client applications that provides consumption logic and methods for automatically exporting data defined in a Web-based schema registry, from the database into the client applications using Web services [¶ 5, 28, 115, 127];

[Claim 3] registering the respective data sources with a schema registry in order to create a schema definition and a DTD [¶ 7, 72, 91,130],

wherein:

[Claim 6] the adapter API includes an XML API comprising the first and second set of methods, wherein the first set of methods comprises a Writer API and the second set comprises a Reader API [¶ 5, 115, 155, 173], and

As to claims 13 - 15 and 18, see the rejections of claims 1 - 3 and 6.


## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.      Claims 7, 11, 12, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sharma as applied to claims 6 and 18 above, and further in view of

Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174 B2; hereinafter Chiang).

As to claims 7 and 19, Sharma teaches that the client applications are modified

with generator logic that makes calls to methods comprising the adapter API, wherein

once called, the Writer API converts data into XML format in memory and transports the

data to the server [¶ 115, 155, 173]. Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML

format data in an XML file. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data in an

XML file [col. 8 lines 2 - 16; col. 11 lines 18 -46]. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these

references because both disclose converting data to XML in order to provide

compatibility between different systems.

As to claims 11 and 23, Sharma teaches that the server includes an import

repository for receiving the XML files generated by the client applications [¶ 115, 173].

As to claims 12 and 24, Sharma teaches that the server includes an XML loader

that parses each of the XML files in the import repository and stores name/value pairs in

the database according to a data hierarchy of the corresponding data source [¶ 55 - 56,

173].

7.      Claims 9, 21 and 25 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sharma in view of Chiang as applied to claims 7 and 19 above, and

further in view of Fry (US 6,880,125 B2).

As to claims 9 and 21, Sharma fails to specifically teach verification. However, Fry teaches wherein the adapter further includes verification code that verifies the generated XML data against the DTD defined in the schema registry [col. 2 lines 61 - 65; col. 3 lines 60 - 64].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to combine these references because Sharma teaches that a streaming parser can be used [¶ 123] and Fry provides further information on parsers, including streaming parsers [col. 3 lines 60 - 64].

As to claim 25, see the rejections of claims 1, 3 and 9.

As to claims 26 and 27, see the rejections of claims 2 and 6.

As to claim 28, Sharma teaches that the server further includes a schema generator for generating the schema definition, a DTD generator for generating the DTD, and an adapter software kit that is downloaded from the server and used to incorporate the adapter API into the client applications [¶ 7, 27, 72, 109].

As to claims 29 and 30, see the rejections of claims 11 and 12.

### Conclusion

8.     Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am - 3:00pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


NP


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER